



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_29292
Title of the Manuscript:	Foreign Migration of Brands discussed under the light of Intersubjectivity Perspective: Illustration with a Case of Food Products
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. IT IS BAD WRITTEN AND NEEDS RE-WRITING 2. IT LACKS IN MANY POINT OF THE PAPER ACADEMIC WRITING: E.G. "LET US CONSIDER" IS THIS AN ASSUMPTION? A HYPOTHESIS? WHY SHOULD I OR ANYBODY ELSE CONSIDER SOMETHING? 3. IN THE ABSTARCT IT HAS QUESTIONS AND QUESTION MARKS. WE WRITE IN A STRAITFORWARD STYLE IN ABSTRACTS. 4. OR "This approach and resulting conclusions might contribute to improve.." SO IF IT IS UNDERSTOOD IT MIGHT NOT CONTRIBUTE. SO WHY READ IT IN THE FIRST PLACE. THE AUTHURS SHOULD STATE WHERE IT WILL CONTRIBUTE. 5. BAD ENGLISH, IN MANY SENTENCES THE ARTICLE OF THE WORD IS MISSING- NEEDS PROOFREADING BY PROFESSIONAL 6. IN INTRODUCTION IT STARTS BADLY, PROVIDING US WITH TH 4 P'S OF MARKETING. THISIS AN ACADEMIC PAPER NOT AN ESSAY. SO START WITH THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ISSUE AND THE PROBLEM WHICH IS ADDRESSED. 7. METHODOLOGICALLY IT LACKS. AND FOR SO ALL THE RESEARCH IS QUESTIONABLE. 8. FIRST OF ALL, WHERE DID THE EXPERIMENT TAKE PLACE 9. UNDER WHICH ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS 10. HOW AND WHY DID THEY USE THE SPECIFIC PRODUCTS FOR THE EXPERIMENT 11. WHY WERE THEY TWO DIFFERENT PRODUCTS FOR	1.We hope corrections done will satisfy the reviewer. 2.Not shared with other reviewers and strange remark considering other journals. However, corrections have been done. 3.Questions contribute to depict the marketing problem linked with the theoretical contribution: no change. 4.Sentence has been changed and corrections have been done in section "Conclusion the same way. 5.Proofreading done. 6.A paragraph was added according to another reviewer's suggestion; however we are afraid this would not be satisfactory for you. 7.Not shared by other reviewers: no change. 8/9.Information was added in sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 . 10.Details were added in section "Introduction"



SDI Review Form 1.6

	TWO DIFFERENT COUNTRIES AND NOT SIMILAR PRODUCTS OF TWO DIFFERENT COUNTRIES 12. HOW WAS THE SUBJECTS RECRUITED? 13. WERE THEY HAEAVY, MEDIUM OR LIGHT USERS OF THE PRODUCTS 14. WHEN THE RESEASRCH WAS DONE HOW MANY RESERACHERS WERE ON SITE IN ORDER TO INSURE THAT THEY SMILE NOT LAUGH- SINCE QUALITATIVE METHOD WAS EMPLOYED 15. WHICH QUALITATIVE METHOD WAS EMPLOYED? (P. 6. LINE 193; 196;211;) 16. WHICH QUALITATIVE SCALE WAS USED, AND HOW WAS CRONBACH A PERFORMED ON QUALITATIVE DATA? 17. WHICH METHOD FOR ANALYZING QUALITATIVE DATA WAS USED 18. P.6.LINE 228 " Answers to questions were given numeric values from -2 to +2, -2 (resp. +2) denoting a negative (resp. 229 positive) answer on the Likert scale and 0 related to "neither agree nor disagree". THE LIKERT SCALE IS NOT A SCALE THAT CAN BE ALTERED AS WISHED. IT IS SPECIFIC. 19. THEN YOU ANALYZE QUALITATIVE DATA 20. BUT AS UNDERSTOOD IT IS NOT QUALITATIVE RESEARCH BUT QUANTITATIVE. 21. IT ALSO GOES BACK AND FORTH IN THE METHODOLOGY SECTION. 22. IT DOES RELIABILITY ANALYSIS CRONBACH A ON A ONE ITEM SCALE (QUESTION 2) 23. SINCE THE METHODOLOGY IS QUESTIONABLE, AND NOT DOCUMENTED, SO ARE THE FINDINGS AND WHATEVER COMES AFTER THAT	and "Method". 11. See additional comments in first paragraph section 2. 12. Already said in section 2.3. 13. Not a variable of influence taking into account last comment in first paragraph section 2.2 . 14. Section 2.2: details were added. 15. L 193: explained in the text. L 196: see appendix as suggested l 194. L 211: comments were added despite the fact this was already explained L 260 in second paragraph section 3.1.3 . 16. First paragraph section 3 explains already coding of answers; after coding it is easy to undertake calculations. 17. See additional comments in section 2.2 . 18/19/20. Likert scale is qualitative. Coding makes it possible for calculation. Coding from 1 to 5 or -2 to +2 just skips the values. From a mathematical standpoint, it does not change neither statistical properties nor conclusions. 21. Not shared by the 5 other reviewers: no change. 22. See point 18. 23. We have a similar point of view regarding this review for the same reasons.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		